

Objections to Strategic Delivery, MM082, BUC043

There are two issues that I would like to raise in objecting to these Modifications.

1 The inclusion of 'at least 130 houses' in the Main Modifications, as opposed to the original fixed figure, increases existing concerns and creates the change that I believe can be commented on within this consultation. In the original planning process, BUC043 was called in by the Secretary of State and ruled to be inappropriate. When carrying out due diligence in the purchase of our present house last year, I became aware of the Secretary of State's intervention and believed that this democratic process would be adhered to. Clearly, I was wrong! It seems that this judgement has been ignored, although it did get a passing reference in papers submitted by AVDC earlier this year. Furthermore, the size of the proposed development has the potential for being even larger than that rejected by the Secretary of State. It is this breach of a lawful process that leads me to conclude that the Main Modifications are not lawful.

2 Any development on this side of Buckingham places unreasonable pressure on an old town centre not designed for the volume of traffic now experienced. This is referenced within report CE01/3, with comments about the high traffic volumes and the potential of exceeding the capacity of junctions within the town. Already it is clear to see the impact of very high traffic volumes through the town and in addition to this, there are insurmountable safety issues caused by the limited visibility and road width at the two main town centre junctions. These problems are caused by the building lines at the Old Gaol that limit view and the complexity of the junctions and narrowness of Castle Street. This causes difficulties for drivers and pedestrians in negotiating these junctions and there are frequent near misses. I now avoid the ecologically better option of cycling through the town centre due to the near misses that I have experienced. The traffic report talks about capacity but what about these safety issues?

Problems have also been raised with traffic congestion around the Whitehead Way development that are likely to be exacerbated by this. While I appreciate this problem is caused by inconsiderate people, it is human nature and an inevitable consequence of vehicle ownership. I have attached the text of a letter from Crabtree Property Management and can provide a copy of the original but that does include my address.

I fully accept that new housing development is essential, but surely it would be better to utilise space to the south of the town where the same issues relating to traffic would not arise and people would have direct commuter routes onto the bypass. In fact, one of the developers in that area did offer to accommodate the 130 houses from this problem site.

It is this potential opportunity for development elsewhere in Buckingham that I believe contravenes the Soundness Test for it being justified and there being reasonable alternatives.

Charlie Hedges